



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A MISCELLANY OF LEXICAL AND TEXTUAL NOTES ON THE BIBLE

CHIEFLY IN CONNECTION WITH THE FIFTEENTH EDITION OF THE
LEXICON BY GESENIUS-BUHL¹

BY FELIX PERLES, Königsberg

EXACTLY a hundred years after the publication of the first edition which marks the beginning of modern Hebrew lexicography we are presented with a new—it is the fourth prepared by Buhl—edition of Gesenius' Lexicon. When it is remembered that a century ago Semitic philology was in its initial stages, that the study of the Old Testament was carried on mainly on traditional lines, and that practically nothing was known of Egyptian, Assyro-Babylonian, and South Arabic antiquity, it will be possible to gauge the extent of the labor which has since then been done in the entire province under consideration and of which our Lexicon represents as it were the epitome. The degree of perfection, however, is not merely ascertainable in comparison with the first edition; even when compared with the last edition which appeared five years ago, a substantial progress is to be recorded which, on its external side, reveals itself in an increase of some fifty pages. Wholly new is a comparison of the linguistic material from the South Arabic inscriptions which is the work of O. Weber.

A random perusal of the new edition has resulted in the following additions and corrections: Reverse of the title-page, l. 1: r. *iudicis*; l. 3: r. *ergastula*.—P. 54, s. v. אָסִיר , there is wanting Zech. 9, 12 התְּקוּהָ אָסִירִי.—P. 127b, s. v. גָּבַשׁ , add: also in New-Hebrew as a verb and in derivatives.—P. 158b, s. v. רָחַן , r.

¹ Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1910.

"die gemeine Hirse."—P. 166a, l. 11 from below, (Syriac) *ר. דרומח*.—P. 208b, l. 10 from below, *ר. חֶבֶל חֶבֶל*.—P. 234b, l. 28 from below, *ר. חֶלֶק חֶלֶק*; *ibid.*, l. 3 from below, *ר. חֶלְקִיהוּ*.—P. 235b, l. 13 from below, *hê met u r. hî mêt u*.—P. 239a, l. 19, Amos 4, 3 r. 4, 5.—P. 243a, l. 5 from below, after "Grünbaum" add: *Ges. Aufs.*, 454.—P. 257b, l. 15 from below, l. *Chwolson*.—P. 299a, l. 7 (in front of *לפת*), for "u." r. "v."—P. 308a, l. 17, *ר. מַמְעִי מַמְעִי*.—P. 324a, l. 20, Prov. 17, 26 r. 11, 24².—P. 366a, l. 20, *ר. וְלֹהֶבֶיִל וְלֹהֶבֶיִל*.—P. 376b, s. v. *לוה* II Niph., the strange form *נְלוֹה* (Isa. 56, 3) for *נְלוֹה* is wanting.—P. 382a, l. 10, after the words "*bei Grünbaum*" add: = *Ges. Aufs.*, 94.—P. 424b, s. v. *מִלֵּה*, l. 8 from below, insert in front of "*Rob, Sm.*": *Geiger, Urschrift*, 301.—P. 426b, the word *מִמּוֹן* Sir. 31, 8 is wholly wanting.—P. 455a, l. 5, remove the words "*Perles An. 32 בעצתו*" from their present position to l. 13 (after Ps. 106, 43).—P. 537b, s. v. *סְבוּת*, add: comp. *Perles*, in *Beiheft II zur O.L.Z.*, 1908, col. 14a (on *Test. Judah* 25, 2).—P. 543b, l. 2 from below, *ר. סִיח*.—P. 557a, s. v. *עֲנָן*, add: In New-Hebrew *עֲנָן* denotes a woman's being without a husband through force of circumstances.—P. 591a, l. 17 from below, after the words "*bei Grünbaum*" add: = *Ges. Schr.*, 282 ff.—P. 600a, l. 11 from below, strike out: *Perles JQR.* 18, 363.—P. 653b, l. 15 from below, *ר. פְּרִיץ פְּרִיץ*.—P. 658a, l. 24, (Syriac) *ר. פֶּרַח פֶּרַח*.—P. 719a, s. v. *קרב* *Ḳal*, the strange form *וּתְרַבְנָה* is missing.—P. 719b, l. 8 from below, *ר. אֶקְרַבְנָה*.—P. 727b, l. 21, *ר. קֶשֶׁת קֶשֶׁת*.—P. 752b, l. 8 from below, for "*zärtlich*" r. "*verzärtelt*."—P. 758b, l. 6 from below, for *ר. קֶב פָּנִים*.—P. 774a, l. 11, for *Dozy* r. *Lane*.—P. 775a, l. 18 from above, insert in front of "*Nestle*": *Geiger, Urschrift*, 367.—P. 809b, l. 10 from below, *ר. אֲשִׁיבְנִי*.—P. 874a, l. 8 from below, insert in front of "*Perles*": *Geiger, Jüd. Zeitschr.*, IX, 204.—P. 876a, l. 14, for "*a m ā r u : Signal*" r. "*a m ā r u sehen, also = Signal.*"

² The mistake is due to an aberration of the eye to the next line where Prov. 17, 26 is actually adduced.

In the list of Hebrew words proposed on the basis of conjectural emendations (p. 885) add the following entries חָשֶׁה speechlessness, s. חָשֶׁה, 263b.—נֹל web s. *Berichtigungen und Nachträge*, XIVa, with reference to p. 135b, גֹּזֵר.—שָׁמַח s. שָׂמַח 781a below.

In the German *Index* note the following corrections: 979a, s. v. "Schlauch," for חֲמִשׁ II r. חֲמַת.—983, s. v. "stark," add: עָצוּם.

As in the case of the two previous editions,³ we present in the following pages a series of lexical and textual observations which may be taken as an original contribution to the interpretation of the Scriptures.

אֶמֶץ

Zech. 6, 3 אֶמֶצִים is explained by a number of scholars in the sense of "red," since in verse 7 it stands directly for אֶדְמִים. It is quite possible that the word stood originally at the outset in verse 2 where it was subsequently replaced by the gloss אֶדְמִים, whereas the original אֶמֶצִים found its way by error at the end of verse 3. The meaning "red" fits in with rabbinic אֹמֶצָא *raw meat* (Levy, *NHWB.*, 41)⁴ the red color of which is expressly alluded to in a number of places, e. g. Pesahim 74b הָאִי אֹמֶצָא דְּאֶסְמִי.

אֶפֶס

The verses Deut. 15, 4-6 are rightly stricken out by Marti (in the new edition of Kautzsch's Bible) as a later gloss, since they contradict verses 6 and 11. How are we, however, to explain the wholly superfluous אֶפֶס at the head of verse 4, which is wanting in the Septuagint and Peshitta? It is not too rash to conjecture that in the Greek period a glossator wrote on the margin אֶפֶס, i. e. ἄφες, in explanation of יָדָה תִּשְׁמַט (end of verse 3), considering that יִשְׁמַט is rendered by ἀφίημι in the Septuagint.⁵ The

³ See *JQR.*, XI, 688-690; XVIII, 388-390.

⁴ The derivation from ὠμός is improbable for the reason that the word occurs exclusively in the *Babylonian Talmud*.

⁵ As is well known, the Midrash repeatedly makes use of the similarity in sound between אֶפֶס and ἄφες for haggadic purposes; see the passages in Krauss, *Lehnwörter*, II, 110a.

word being omitted in the two oldest versions, the *possibility* of a Greek gloss in the present passage will not be contested.⁶ The gloss was then copied into the text immediately after תשמט ירך and taken for a Hebrew word; it was then natural, when verses 4-6 were received into the text, that the word was drawn to the following.

A similar instance of an originally non-Hebrew gloss being taken for Hebrew on its admission into the text is Ezek. 20, 37 במסרת הברית where ברית = Babyl. *biritu* "bond" was originally intended as an explanation of מַסֵּרָה; see my observation *JQR.*, XVIII, 384, and comp. below on Gen. 22, 13.

בְּאֵרִים

Isa. 24, 15 we expect in the place of the difficult בְּאֵרִים rather an apostrophe naming those who are bidden praise the Lord. I therefore conjecture that we should point בְּאֵרִים "inhabitants of *Berytus* (Beirut)."⁷ It fits in well with the parallel הַיָּם that just this port should be mentioned. It is true, the city does not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament, but mention is frequently made of it as *Beruna* and *Berutu* in the Amarna tablets.⁸ The name בְּאֵרִים is simply the plural of בֶּאֵר *well*, as is expressly attested by Stephen of Byzantium.⁹ This would also explain the form בְּאֵרִי in the place of בְּאֵרֹתִי¹⁰ as we might expect. For the subsequent relations of *Berytus* and the Jews

⁶ If my conjecture be right, then the omission of the gloss in the Septuagint and Peshitta would furnish proof for the latter also that the Hebrew text underlying these versions was current for some time side by side with the sources of the Masoretic recension. An analogous case is afforded by the Papyrus Nash proving that, so far as Deuteronomy is concerned, there was circulating in the second post-Christian century a Hebrew text deviating from the Masoretic.

⁷ Comp. Isa. 42, 10 where in a similar context Kedar and Sela are called upon to praise the Lord.

⁸ Comp. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, I, 309, n., and 436.

⁹ *S. v.* Βηρυτός: ἐκλήθη διὰ τὸ εὐδρονον · βῆρ γὰρ τὸ φέρει παρ' αὐτοῖς.

¹⁰ As a gentilic of the Benjamite city בְּאֵרִים frequently.

consult the article by Krauss, *JE.*, II, 647-8, and the literature there adduced.

בתה
ת

The word בתה which occurs only Isa. 5, 6 should probably be stricken from the lexicon; it is apparently a mere remnant of the reading ואשביתהו for ואשיתהו. It is true that in present Hebrew text we meet only with the *Kal* שבת in the sense of "lying fallow";¹¹ but both the rendering of the Septuagint (*ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελῶνα μου*) and the following לא יזמר ולא יעדר speak in favor of the supposition that ואשביתהו was the original reading.¹² Instances where the two stems שית and שבת are confounded may be adduced from other places in the Scriptures, e. g. Job 10, 20 where we must read with Lagarde ישבת in the place of ושית, and Job 38, 11 where in the place of ישית בנאון גלִיד we ought certainly to read "שבת נאון ג" (comp. my *Analekten*, 87). Perhaps for אשית Jer. 51, 38 we should likewise read אשבית. In the present passage, the word בתה may have originated in the following manner: when the faulty reading ואשיתהו had found its way into the text, a copyist wrote above it by way of correction בתה, hence: ואשיתהו. A subsequent scribe mistook the superscribed letters for an omission; in this fashion our masoretic reading arose.

נורל

May not the Greek *καλήρος* for which it is difficult to find a satisfactory Greek etymology be a loan-word going back to נורל? For the transposition of *l* and *r* we have abundant examples in the case of foreign words transplanted from one language into another.¹³ As for Greek *κ* for Semitic נ, comp.

¹¹ משבתה Lam. 1, 7 similarly refers to the ground's lying fallow; comp.

Midrash Eḥah *ad locum* where it is correctly paraphrased by שומטה.

¹² Comp. Lev. 25, 4 where we meet with the same expression וכרמך לא תזמר with reference to the year of rest.

¹³ In addition to the examples given by my father (*Byzant. Zeitschr.*, II, 583) and by myself (*ibid.*, VIII, 544) we might name Syriac קלמרא "inkwell" from *καλαμάριον*; Spanish *Argel* (= Algier) from *al-jazīrah*.

read originally: לֹא דָגַל:¹⁷ "there is no *falsehood* upon his tongue."¹⁸ Thus also the preposition עַל which it is difficult to construe with a verb would find its explanation. It is not impossible that the correct reading was still extant in the Hebrew copy used by the Greek translator, though he took it for a verb (*οὐκ ἐδόλωσεν ἐν γλώσσῃ αὐτοῦ*). Likewise Sir. 5, 14 (וּבְלִשׁוֹנְךָ אֵל תְּרַגֵּל (רע))¹⁹ which it is safe to say imitates our verse, we should read תְּדַגֵּל: "*lie* not with thy tongue." The concluding word (רע) which is wanting in both versions may with certainty be pronounced a later addition.

הַמֵּר

A verb hitherto unrecognized appears to be extant in בְּהִמִּיר Ps. 46, 3. Aside from the fact that the *Hiphil* הִמִּיר (except in the obscure passage Mic. 2, 4) is never used intransitively, the meaning of the stem does not fit the context. According to my judgment, the vocalization alone is erroneous: read בְּהִמֵּר "when the earth is dissolved"²⁰ from the stem הִמֵּר = Arabic *hmr* which means both "pour out" and "be poured out." מִהִּמְרוֹת Ps. 140, 11 seems likewise to go back to the same stem.

זִמְרִי as the name of a people

Jer. 25, 25 is still awaiting an explanation; it is wanting in the Septuagint and the Old Latin. Duhm conjectures that it represents a cipher, say for רומאי, which has the same numerical value! Such recourse to *gematria* in a modern commentary par-

¹⁷ לֹא (in the place of the expected אֵין) before a noun as Job 18, 17 לֹא שָׁבַת אֱלֹהִים אֵלֵיהֶם 21, 9; וְלֹא שָׁם לוֹ עַל פְּנֵי חֵיץ.

¹⁸ For דָּגַל in this sense we have instances in New-Hebrew (Cant. rabba, ed. Romm, 15a, on 2, 4) אוֹתָן הִדְגֹּלִין שְׂדֵגֵל יַעֲקֹב בְּאֵבִיו and in the place just quoted וְדִגְלוּ עָלֵי אַהֲבָה. In the Targum of Proverbs which is dependent on the Syriac Version the verb דָּגַל and its derivatives occur frequently; in our texts, however, דָּגַל is disfigured into רָגַל (see Levy, *Targ. Wbch.*, I, 162).

¹⁹ 4, 28 we find likewise וְאֵל לִשׁוֹנְךָ אֵל תְּרַגֵּל. The whole sentence, however, is missing in both versions; it is probably a misplaced doublet to 5, 14.

²⁰ Comp. the parallel in v. 7 תִּמְוֶה אֶרֶץ.

takes of the nature of a jest. It is quite probable, however, that we are dealing here with a cipher. In the light of the word ששך in the following verse which is universally acknowledged as a symbol for בבל (according to the permutation "אתב"ש)²¹ it is not far-fetched to see in זמרי a cryptograph for עילם which immediately follows. Now, it is true, עילם, according to the "אתב"ש, would result in זמכי. We need not, however, be surprised that this unknown word which has certainly an un-Hebrew sound was at an early period replaced by the otherwise known זמרי which as the name of a king was also graphically quite similar. Now we may understand why the four words זמרי מלכי זמרי ואת כל מלכי עילם are wanting in the Septuagint, being nothing else than a doublet of ואת כל מלכי עילם.

כשיל וכילפות

Ps. 74, 6 כשיל וכילפות was apparently chosen intentionally with a view to the Greek *ξόλον* and *χάλψ* which designate the two parts of an axe. This allusive play on Greek terms is not surprising in a Maccabean psalm.

$$\overline{\text{למר}} = \text{drive on}$$

Jer. 10, 2 אל תלמדו אל דרך הגוים אל is difficult grammatically; hence the rendering "go" in a number of the versions which probably represents a mere guess from the context. I propose תלמדו in the signification "be driven on, be impelled." This meaning may readily be inferred from the noun מלמר "an ox-goad"; comp. also Jer. 31, 18 ענל לא למר (similarly Hos. 10, 11). According to Gesenius-Buhl, s. v., the primary meaning of the stem is "goad on."

In Is. 40, 16 וילמדו בארה משפט the verb is certainly to be rendered "guide" (Septuagint: *συνεβίβασεν αὐτόν*). The same semantic development from "guide" to "teach" may be witnessed also in הורה.

²¹ Similarly 51, 41 and לב קמי for כשדים 51, 1.

מַחָה

Prov. 31, 3 מַלְכִּין מַחָה וּדְרִיכִךְ חִילֶךְ I suggest that in the obscure מַחָה there may be present perhaps a derivative from *μοιχάω* (*μοιχός adulterer*). The presence of a Greek word in this passage should be nothing strange; it may be taken rather as characteristic of the decadence of Jewish family life in Hellenistic times that the writer intentionally chose a Greek word. Moreover, מַחִי for some form of the verb *μοιχάω* occurs in the Midrash (Cant. rabba on 3, 4): פֶּרִי פֶלְאִי קָתִים: כִּי מַחִי.²²

מְכַרָּה

Prov. 31, 10 מְכַרָּה מִפְּנִינִים רַחוּק is doubly difficult: in the first place we find nowhere else רַחוּק in the sense demanded by the context here, and secondly the commercial figure of acquiring a wife is least of all to be expected in this chapter. Perhaps we ought to point: מְכַרָּה "the place where she may be found (comp. Zeph. 2, 9 מְכַרָּה מֶלֶח)²³ is more distant than that where corals are found." i. e. she is farther away to seek and more difficult to find. That is poetic and safeguards רַחוּק its original sense.

מִלָּא

מִלָּא "multitude, troop" shows exactly the same development of meaning as Assyrian *millu* (Delitzsch, *HWB.*, 414a).

מִנְהָרוֹת

Judg. 6, 2 אֵת הַמִּנְהָרוֹת אֲשֶׁר בְּהָרִים. So much may be gathered from the context that a hiding-place in the mountains made with human hands must be meant. Perhaps it denotes "subterranean passages," "shafts," comp. Job 28, 10 בְּצוּרוֹת יָאֲרִים "shafts." בקע where many commentators assume the meaning "shafts."

²² Comp. Israel Lewy, *Über die Spuren des griech. u. röm. Altertums im talmud. Schrifttum*, 80 (in: *Verhandlungen der 33. Philologenversammlung*).

²³ The basic meaning: place where something is dug after (כִּרָּה).

The figure is wholly appropriate, since a mine with shafts and galleries is similar to a river with its tributaries. Perhaps we ought to take the word נהר in the rather difficult sentence Job 28, 11 מבכי נהרות חבש in the same sense, i. e. as "shaft," "gallery."

משאות

Lam. 2, נביאִיךָ חזוֹ לךְ שׁוֹא... ויִחְזוּ לךְ מִשְׁאוֹת שׁוֹא ומְדוּחִים represents a tautology which within one and the same verse is not tolerable. Perhaps the text read originally ויִחְזוּ לךְ מִשְׁאוֹת ומְדוּחִים. If that be so, then מִשְׁאוֹת²⁴ is to be derived from הָשִׂיא "beguile" and taken as synonymous with מְדוּחִים, whereas שׁוֹא was merely an explanatory gloss on the unusual מִשְׁאוֹת and then admitted into the text through error. The verb הָשִׂיא is used just of deceitful prophecies (Jer. 29, 8, comp. 4, 10). For the juxtaposition of the synonyms מִשְׁאוֹת אֵל יֵשִׂיא אֶתְכֶם חֻקֵּיהֶם וְאֵל יֵסִיתָ אֶתְכֶם com. II Chr. 32, 15 ומְדוּחִים and in New-Hebrew the standing formula מְסִית ומְרִיחַ.

נולִי

נולִי, once also נולִי, Biblical Aramaic, "heap of rubbish" (so rather than "dung-hill"), is compared by Gesenius-Buhl conjecturally with Assyrian na malu (na w alu) "ruin." But this leaves the ending י unexplained. I would therefore place it beside Assyrian na mlītu (for which, it is true, no example is available at the present moment), from mal ū (= מלא), in the sense of "rubbish," properly "filled up ground." Thus far, examples are available only for ta ml ū and mu l ū, "heaping up," "terrace," and for the verb מלא III¹¹ = "cause to be thrown up" (Delitzsch, *HWB.*, 410a). In the Babylonian Talmud (Baba batra 54a) מוליא designates directly "rubbish"; comp. also מליתא Heb. מלוא "dam," "earthwork," prop. *anything heaped up*.

²⁴ Or מִשְׁאוֹת which, it is true, occurs in an entirely different sense? We find מִשְׁאוֹן in the sense of "deceit" (Prov. 26, 26).

עמיהוד

I would explain the proper noun masculine עמיהוד as עמיהוד, i. e. as a compound = עם (= Arab. 'amm) and יהוד. It is true, the abbreviated form יהוד for יהודה occurs at present only in Biblical Aramaic; it may nevertheless be assumed that it underlies the place-name יהוד Josh. 19, 45. For other proper nouns compounded with עם comp. the literature adduced by Gesenius-Buhl, fifteenth edition, 591 below, s. v. עם II.

עמקם?

Jer. 47, 5 שארית עמקם is rendered in the Targum שאר תוקפהון. The latter does not presuppose, as has been assumed, a reading עזם; the translator merely gave to the word the meaning "power," specifically "military power," which is actually extant in the case of Assyrian em ū ḫ u. Nevertheless, the original reading was probably עמקרן, i. e. the original form of עקרן as it still underlies Assyrian Amḫarruna (comp. also in the Septuagint Ἀκκαρών by the side of Ἀκαρών). The mention of Ekron as one of the cities of the Philistian pentarchy is in the first place quite appropriate in the context; secondly, it is suggested by the parallel passage Zeph. 2, 4.²⁵ The error in our passage arose perhaps in consequence of the fact that the word was abbreviated to עמק and that the abbreviation was then falsely resolved. Whether the Septuagint read in our passage ענקים, may be reasonably doubted. The translator, unable to make sense of עמקם, merely made a guess to which Josh. 11, 22 readily led the way.

נעתרות

Prov. 27, 6 נאמנים פצעי אוהב ונעתרות נשיות שונא. The current explanation of נעתרות in the sense "abundant" fails to supply an effective contrast to נאמנים. On the basis of Ezek. 8, 11 ועתר ענן הקטרת עליה, I would explain נעתר as "vapor-like" which is an appropriate epithet for the false kisses of an enemy in contrast with a friend's well-meant

²⁵ Comp. also Jer. 25, 20; Am. 1, 8; Zech. 9, 5. 7.

blows. A good parallel is offered in a similar context by Hos. 6, 4 וּחִסְדֶּכֶם כַּעֲנֵן בֶּקָר.

פֶּרֶחַ

By the side of פֶּרֶחַ "bud" (= Arab. *frḥ*) and פֶּרֶחַ "fly" (= Syriac פֶּרֶחַ) there seems to have existed in Hebrew a third stem פֶּרֶחַ which corresponds to Arabic *fariḥa* and signifies "rejoice": Isa. 35, 2 וְתִגְלֵ אֶף רֵנָּה כְּבוֹד הַלְבָּנוֹן the parallel verbs indicate with certainty the signification mentioned. Perhaps a play on פֶּרֶחַ "bud" in verse 1 was intended.

פָּרַק

Jer. 10, 13 (= 51, 16; Ps. 135, 7) לְמַטֵּר עֶשֶׂה בְּרָקִים is grammatically very strange. Perhaps we have to do with an old error, the original reading being פָּרַקִים. "He maketh *appointed seasons* for the rain." Although the word פָּרַק in this meaning does not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament, we may justly assume with a view to its frequent occurrence in the tannaitic literature²⁶ that it also existed in the older stage of Hebrew, since it cannot very well have been borrowed from Aramaic where the word is altogether unknown in a similar meaning. The context in which our verse is found explains how it was replaced by the more common בֶּרֶק. In Jeremiah where פָּרַקִים would on the whole be less appropriate, the entire passage from וְעֵלָה to מֵאַצְרֵתִי may perhaps have constituted a marginal note calling attention to the parallel in Ps. 135, 7, which subsequently passed into the text itself through error.

קֶדֶם

The semantic development of the word קֶדֶם which combines the notions "east," "front," and (in Aramaic) "the first" may perhaps be connected with the manner of orientation of the Hebrews in Palestine. Accordingly the first (= chief) direction constituted the orientation in contrast to the Babylonian conception which placed the chief direction in the north; hence *ištānu*

²⁶ E. g. Abot 5, 9; Rosh ha-shanah 1, 2. In a single passage (Tos. Rosh ha-shanah 1, 12) we find even פָּרַק גְּשָׁמִים "the period of rain showers."

signifies in that language both "north" and "one" (or "first") and is used interchangeably with *irtānu* which denotes the direction of the breast (*irtu*).

קֶלְקֶל

Num. 21, 5 קֶלְקֶל is perhaps an ancient broken plural = *kalākīlu* which denotes the *name of a plant*. If that be so, we should point בֶּלֶחֶם הַקֶּלְקֶל and the phrase would then mean bread prepared out of קֶלְקֶל. A similar broken plural is extant in עֲרֵיעַר and (according to Hommel) in שְׂרוּחָן Josh. 19, 6 (= سراحين from سراحين).

שְׁהַר

The stem שְׁהַר = Aram. סהר for which only two examples are cited, שְׁהַרִּי Job 16, 19 and the purely Aramaic שְׁהַרִּיתָא Gen. 31, 47, seems to have stood originally in still another passage: Mal. 2, 5 עַד מִמֶּהָרַם בְּמִכְשָׁפִים is flat and trivial. Once we read מִשְׁהַר, an excellent sense is the result. The graphic similarity of ר and ד and (in the Old Hebrew) of מ and ש occasioned the change, especially since מִשְׁהַר was a rare word in Hebrew. The construction מִשְׁהַר ב corresponds exactly to the Aramaic *Pael* סהר which when construed with ב means "testify against."

שְׁמַל

From the time of Gesenius, שְׁמַל = شَمَال (by the side of شَمَال and شَامِل) is universally explained as a formation from شَام by means of the suffix *-l*. This derivation is contradicted by Assyrian *šumēlu* which, to judge from the vocalization, points to an original *šum'ēlu* which, to be sure, is a form baffling explanation. May the conjecture be advanced that the vocalization of the word rests on a popular etymology according to which the word was taken as a compound = *šum ili* "name of God?" In that case the word may have been borrowed from Assyrian into the

²⁷ Freytag, III, 492a, where also divers other names of plants from the same stem. Perhaps Assyrian *kuikullānu*, as Peiser thinks, goes with it; comp. Muss-Arnolt, 914.

other Semitic languages; the spelling with **ס** would receive a natural explanation. If our theory should prove acceptable, an interesting parallel might be cited from Greek: *εὐδοννυμος* (from *εὖ* and *δονομα*)—"left" shows the identical euphemism in the same concept. One may even go farther and surmise in the Greek term a trace of Oriental influence.

שְׂמַת

Ezek. 36, 3 **שְׂמַת וְשֹׂאף אֲתֹכֶם** has thus far remained a puzzle. Both Septuagint (*ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀτιμασθῆναι ἡμᾶς*) and Peshitta (עַל דִּאֲצַטְעֶרְתּוֹן) take **שְׂמַת** in a sense which alone fits the context and is, moreover, confirmed by **לָבוּ וּלְלַעַג**²⁸ in verse 4. I therefore regard the word as an infinitive *Piel* the stem **שְׂמַת** (comp. **יִפֵּר** Ps. 118, 18 and the like). This stem which meets us otherwise only in Jewish-Aramaic²⁹ and Arabic³⁰ may certainly be credited to Ezekiel. In the present passage, the meaning "gaze with malicious

²⁸ Thus, of course, we ought to read, as has long been recognized, for **לָבוּ**.

²⁹ *Pael* **שְׂמַת** "to put in the ban"; **שְׂמַתָּא** "ban"; **שְׂמַתִּית** (so it ought to be pointed) "put in the ban." Levy advocates the vocalization **שְׂמַתָּא**; he takes it as a contraction from **שְׂמַתָּא** and regards **שְׂמַת** as a denominative verb. This view, however, is untenable; for, in the first place, we find the part. **שְׂמַתִּית** (Targum Yerush. Deut. 7, 26); secondly, we have in Arabic with the corresponding change of the sibilant **سَمَت** (by the side of **شَمَت**).

Kohut, *s. v.*, has already thought of the Arabic **شَمَت**.

³⁰ While in the formation I. we find only **شَمَتَ** "have malicious joy," the forms **شَمَتَ** and **سَمَتَ** are met with by the side of each other in II., with the meaning "bless a sneezer." Professor Hommel has been kind enough to inform me that, according to the Arab native lexicographers, **شَمَتَ** is the current and better form in the place of **شَمَتَ**. At the same time he gives expression to a plausible conjecture that the II. form originally meant "execrate the evil demons." For **شَمَتَ** "have malicious joy" he mentions as old instances Hudh. 25, 5; 48, 5; 51, 1; 'Alkama 9, 1.

joy" for which Arabic offers numerous instances is most appropriate.

שֶׁתֶּר בֹּחֲנִי

The proper name שֶׁתֶּר בֹּחֲנִי which occurs several times in the book of Ezra is paralleled by the name שֶׁתֶּרְכֹּן in the Assuan papyri (A, 16; E, 18). In a previous review of these papyri³¹ I ventured the opinion that the biblical name likewise read originally שֶׁתֶּרְכֹּנִי, though the received form is as old as the Septuagint. The similarity of ב and ר in the Old Hebrew script was especially favorable to the interchange of the two letters. The resolution of the word into שֶׁתֶּר בֹּחֲנִי is readily explained from the circumstance that the first element was identified with the name שֶׁתֶּר occurring in Est. 1, 14.

TEXTUAL NOTES (ACCORDING TO THE ORDER OF THE BIBLICAL BOOKS)

Gen. 1, 26 וּבְכָל הָאָרֶץ interrupts the context in the enumeration of the several species of animals. It has been proposed to read with Peshitta וּבְכָל חֵית הָאָרֶץ. It seems to me more plausible to read וּבְכָל הַשָּׂרִץ; comp. 1, 20-21; 7, 21.

Gen. 22, 13 וְהָנָה אֵיל אַחֵר נֶאֱחָז . At one time I thought of emending אַחֵר for which all the ancient witnesses read אַחֵר into אֶחָז. Now, however, the reading אַחֵר appears to me to be correct. I regard it as an Aramaic gloss (= אַחִיר, as the Targum *ad locum* actually reads) for נֶאֱחָז, which was subsequently misunderstood and admitted into the text.

Gen. 31, 13 אֲנִכִּי הָאֵל בֵּית אֵל is strange on account of the grammatically impossible article ה in front of אֵל. I conjecture that the ה was originally an abbreviation for יְהוָה;³² the sentence thus read: *I am J., the God of Bethel*. It is clear that our verse refers back to Gen. 28, 18-22, and there the text quite unambiguously reads: וְהָיָה יְהוָה לִי לְאֵלִים. It may further be conjectured, since our chapter from verse 4 on belongs to the Elohist, that v. 31 stood originally immediately after v. 3 to which it is a

³¹ *OLZ.*, XI (1908), col. 28.

³² See Geiger, *Urschrift*, 244.

fit sequel³⁴ and which in point of fact comes from the pen of the Jahvist. On the other hand, v. 14 connects well with v. 12.

Gen. 46, 3 אנכי האל אלהי אביך shows the same difficulty as in the passage just discussed. It may be conjectured that the original read אנכי יהוה אלהי אביך; אל represents the catchword to אלהי which through a copyist's error remained in the text and was then naturally drawn to the abbreviation ה' thus forming האל. Comp. my *Analekten*, 43-44, where further examples are adduced for catchwords wrongly inserted in the text; many more examples may easily be adduced.

Ex. 5, 12 לקשש קש לתבן, though presupposed by the versions, is quite tautological. I propose ללִבֵּן; comp. verse 7 and especially verse 14 where the verb is used absolutely as in the present passage. The error is due to an aberration of the eye to the word התבן at the end of the following verse.

Lev. 14, 57 לחורות ביום חטא וביום חטא is rendered in Peshitta ולמפרש בית טמאא לרביא. The Jerusalem Targum, likewise, has beside its translation reflecting the Masoretic text the following additional element: ובין בר נשא מסאבא לבין בר נשא. This undoubtedly points to the original reading לחורות בין חטא וביום חטא; comp. Lev. 10, 10-11 and particularly Ezek. 44, 23 ואת עמי יורו בין קדש לחול ובין טמא לטהור יודיעום, similarly also Ezek. 22, 26. The reading of the Masoretic text is to be explained as an erroneous explication of an abbreviated בי. For the abbreviation of יום we have an example Deut. 32, 35 where, with the Samaritan, we ought to read ליום נקם for the masoretic לי נקם.

Lev. 19, 31 אל תבקשו לטמאה בהם is, as far as the style goes, very strange. What is בקש to mean here? It would have been simpler to say just אל תטמאו. May not the original have read תוקשו as we find Deut. 7, 25 פן תוקש בו in a similar context and Deut. 12, 30 פן תנקש אחריהם where likewise the original reading will have been תוקש unless תנקש was a legitimate

³³ See further below on Gen. 46, 3; Isa. 5, 19; I Chr. 29, 22, and my *Analekten*, 17 ff. (particularly on Ps. 68, 20) and 92, also *REJ.*, XXXV (1897), 59, on Sirach 24, 1.

³⁴ Verse 13b repeats expressly the admonition contained in verse 3b.

synonym for תוקש? May it be further assumed that in our passage also there stood originally תנקשו אל?

Deut. 33, 11 מתני קמיו has so far not been explained on its grammatical side. Every difficulty disappears as soon as we read by simply dividing the words differently: מתני מקמיו, i. e. מְקִימָיו, i. e. the loins of them that *provoke* him; comp. Gen. 49, 9, מי יְקִימֵנו. According to Wellesz³⁵ and Chwolson,³⁶ v. 11 belongs right after verse 7b, hence *Judah* (and not *Levi*!) is spoken of. That would make the proposed emendation still more probable, since Gen. 49, 9 says just of *Judah* מי יְקִימֵנו.

Deut. 33, 16 תְּבוֹאֲתָה לְרֹאשׁ יוֹסֵף is a monstrous form which has thus far baffled explanation. It has been proposed to read תְּבוֹאָה. According to my judgment, תְּבוֹאָה is rather a conflate of the two words תָּאֲתָה and תְּבוֹא of which the latter was a gloss on the former.³⁷ The verb אָתָה occurs in our chapter twice in addition. It is true that the feminine form still remains a puzzle. For further examples of conflate readings see my *Analekten*, 82, also *OLZ.*, VIII (1905), 181, on I Chr. 12, 33 where לָעֵדָר arose out of לָעֵדֶר and לָשֶׁדֶר and further below on I Sam. 1, 6 and Lam. 3, 49; comp. also Job 22, 21 where בּוֹ אָתָךְ, exactly as in our passage, seems to be a conflate of תָּאֲתָךְ and תְּבוֹאָךְ.

Josh. 7, 5 וַיִּרְדּוּ לִפְנֵי הַשָּׂעֵר עַד הַשְּׂבָרִים. For the difficult השְּׂבָרִים I would propose the pointing השְּׂבָרִים, as actually underlies the rendering of Peshiṭta (עֲדָמָא דֵּאֲתַתְּבְּרוּ). The *Niphal* of שָׁבַר occurs in a similar use and in a similar context II Chr. 14, 12; comp. also Dan. 11, 22. On the side of style, the nearest parallel is Deut. 7, 23 where it is said of the defeated enemy וְנָתַתָּם ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ לִפְנֶיךָ... עַד הַשְּׂמֹדִם.

Josh. 17, 14 עַד אֲשֶׁר עַד כֹּה בִּרְכֵנִי ה' is strange, the first עַד being absolutely beyond explanation. We must, however, neither strike it out nor emend it into עַל; it is simply an abbre-

³⁵ *OLZ.*, VII (1904), col. 341.

³⁶ In his "Nachträge" to the "Das letzte Passahmahl Christi," 1898, 184, n. 1.

³⁷ Or did the text read תְּבוֹאָה וְאָתָתָה (as Mic. 4, 8 תָּאֲתָה וְבָאָה)?

I Kings 12, 10 הקל מעלינו is perhaps to be pointed מַעֲלָנוּ comp. הקל מעברת אביך הקשה ומעלו הכבד. Similarly we should read Lam. 3, 28 with Peshiṭta עָלוּ for עָלִיו; comp. verse 27. The same confusion also underlies Sir. 6, 29 in the Septuagint⁴⁰ and 30, 13 in Peshiṭta.

I Kings 15, 30 (comp. II Chr. 15, 16) contains a difficulty which has thus far escaped attention. The verb כרת "cut," "hew," does not fit in with מפלצת which beyond doubt denotes a *metal* object, as is shown with clearness by וידק in the passage in Chronicles. One would rather expect an expression like "break in pieces." That would be in Hebrew כתת which is used Deut. 9, 21; Mic. 1, 7; II Chr. 34, 7 with reference to images of idols that are broken in pieces. In our passage the proper form would be וַיִּכְתֶּת. Observe in particular the agreement of Deut. 9, 21 with II Chr. 15, 16, since there as well as here כתת, דקק, and שרף would constitute parallels.

Isa. 5, 19 ימחר יחישא. The ה in יחישא is strange, since it is wanting in ימחר. Perhaps it represents a misconceived abbreviation for יהוה, God not being mentioned in the preceding part at all, whereas it would afford a good parallel to קדוש ישראל in the second half of the verse. See above on Gen. 31, 13.⁴¹

Isa. 21, 2 עלי עילם צורי מדי I would emend into צור ומדי: "Go up, O *Elam*, *Tyre*, and *Media*." The collocation of *Elam*, *Tyre*, and *Media* is rather strange from a geographical point of view; still an explanation may be found in the circum-

⁴⁰ Comp. my observation *REJ.*, XXXV (1897), 52.

⁴¹ Likewise, Job 32, 8 where רוח ה' היא באנוש is emended by many commentators into רוח יהוה, receives its simplest explanation if we assume an abbreviated ה'. In a letter, dated April 30, 1903, Professor Hommel expresses his opinion that also Ex. 15, 2 (= Isa. 12, 2; Ps. 118, 14) the original read עזי ומרתי ה' and that our present text is based on a misconception of the abbreviation. The redundant יהוה after יה in the present text of Isa. 12. 2 was originally a gloss on the abbreviation ה'.

stance that Tyre had withstood a protracted siege at the hands of Nebuchadnezzar and might therefore be apostrophized as a dangerous foe of Babylon.

Isa. 31, 2 ועל עזרת פעלי און is not to be derived from עזרה "help," but from עזרה "court" which fits in excellently with the parallel בית; comp. elsewhere עליה and הצר in parallelism to בית. The circumstance that the word עזרה is only met with in late books (Ezekiel and Chronicles) is of no importance; the word occurs also in Arabic, *'adīratu(n)*, hence, as may be seen from interchange of sounds, is common Semitic.

Isa. 44, 11 מאדמם המה וחרשים is difficult both grammatically and exegetically. I would propose the emendation מאדמים "blush" which would go well with the parallel יבשו. The omission of the plural ending admits of a ready explanation; comp. my *Analekten*, 29. It is true, we nowhere find in the Old Testament האדים in the sense "blush with shame," but an instance is available in the Midrash⁴² (in connection with a haggadic exposition of אדום שהאדים פני דור : עובר אדום).

Isa. 60, 4 על צד תאמנה בניך מרחוק יבאו ובנתיך. As far as I know, no objection has been raised by critics to this verse although it offers a great difficulty. It is not quite easy to conceive how an adult person can be carried on the *side*; for the daughters are certainly not thought of as infants that they should be *carried*, especially since the sons come of themselves. All difficulties disappear when we read צב: "thy daughters shall be carried in the *litter*"; comp. 66, 20 where we read exactly in a similar context והביאו את כל אחיכם מכל הגוים ... ובצבים. The Peshiṭta, likewise, which renders על צד by על פריותא must certainly have read צב. It may be casually noted that 66, 12 על צד תנשאו is rendered by Peshiṭta in the same manner; nevertheless צב there, though possible, is quite unnecessary, for there indeed the writer has in mind the figure of small children (וינקתם, על ברכים תשעשעו). The interchange of ב and ו in our passage goes back to their similarity in Old

⁴² Num. rabba 4, 20 (ed. Romm, 14b, below).

Hebrew script; comp. my *Analekten*, 51, on Ps. 69, 11. Further examples: Gen. 9, 7 וּרְדוּ בָהּ for which read with Nestle וּרְדוּ בָהּ; Josh. 15, 47 וְהַנְּבֹל for which the Hebrew margin and the versions have הַנְּדֹל; Ezek. 40, 2 מִנְּנֵב which in the Septuagint appears as מִנְּנֵר; comp. also below on Ezek. 30, 4.

Jer. 1, 15 וְעַל כָּל חוֹמוֹתֶיהָ סָבִיב וְעַל כָּל עִיר יְהוּדָה. It is very strange that it is said here of the hostile kings that they will place their thrones *upon* the walls of Jerusalem and *upon* all the cities of Judah. The preceding וְנָתַנוּ אִישׁ כִּסְאוֹ פָתָה precludes our taking the expression figuratively; the former sentence is certainly meant concretely. It is still less plausible to take עַל here in a hostile sense = "against," for that would yield a distorted sense, a throne being surely no weapon which may be directed against a wall or city. I therefore propose the reading וְעָלּוּ עַל כָּל חוֹמוֹתֶיהָ וְנָוּ, "and they shall *scale* all her walls round about and *storm* all the cities of Judah." It is true that elsewhere we find עָלָה in this particular sense construed with the accusative: Joel 2, 7 עָלוּ חוֹמָה, Prov. 21, 22 עִיר נִבְרִים עָלָה חָכָם. Shall we perhaps take עָלוּ in the present passage (as frequently elsewhere) simply in the sense "march against?" It is certainly clear that in the sequence of letters עָלוּ וְעָלָה the second וְעָלָה may readily have been omitted; see further below on Eccl. 7, 26.

Jer. 16, 16 הֲנִי שֶׁלַח לְדוֹגִים רַבִּים נָאִם ה' וְדִינוֹם וְאַחֲרֵי כֵן אֲשַׁלַּח לְרַבִּים צִידִים וְצִדּוֹם. While the first רַבִּים is superfluous, the second is directly ungrammatical. It seems to me therefore that the original read: הֲנִי שֶׁלַח לְדוֹגִים נָאִם ה' וְדִינוֹם וְאַחֲרֵי כֵן אֲשַׁלַּח לְרַבִּים צִידִים וְצִדּוֹם. The word רַבִּים has here, as Duhm has seen, the meaning "archers," specifically "hunters," as Jerem. 50, 29 and perhaps Job 16, 13; comp. also Gen. 21, 20 (of the *hunter*) רַבֵּה קֶשֶׁת. If this be so, then the word צִידִים represents a subsequent gloss⁴⁸ on the unusual רַבִּים; at a still later period when רַבִּים was no

⁴⁸ In Gen. 21, 20 קֶשֶׁת is most probably likewise a gloss on רַבֵּה.

more understood, the same word was likewise inserted in the first half of the verse for the sake of the supposed parallelism.

Jer. 30, 19 והרבתי ולא ימעטו והכבדתי ולא יצערו. The overlined words are missing in the Septuagint. This suggests the possibility that ימעטו ולא ימעטו והרבתי represents but a gloss on the less frequent expressions that follow, which indeed is in perfect accord with the sense. The parallel passage Job 14, יבדו בניו ולא ידע ויצערו ולא יבין למו, shows that כבד was used not only as an adjective (as in numerous passages), but also as a verb, in the sense "be many." There, the Septuagint has: *πολλῶν δὲ γενομένων τῶν υἱῶν οὐκ οἶδεν, ἐὰν δὲ ὀλίγοι γένωνται οὐκ ἐπίσταται.*

Jer. 48, 10 עשה מלאכת ה' רמיה is perhaps to be pointed מלאכת ה'; comp. Hag. 1, 13 במלאכות ה'. An indirect support for this conjecture is perhaps the fact that the Septuagint renders מלאכת by the plural *τὰ ἔργα*; hence it read מלאכות with ו.⁴⁴ Exactly as in this passage מלאכות would be the object to the verb עשה, we find in New-Hebrew עשה שליחות פלו'.

Ezek. 18, 7 חבלתו חוב ישיב has thus far received no satisfactory explanation. Modern commentators for the most part either take with Cornill חוב as a corruption from שוב, or with Nöldeke⁴⁵ strike the word out altogether as a dittogram from חבלתו. It seems, to me, nevertheless, that the text is perfectly in order: חבלתו חוב is to be taken as a construct state construction with the ancient case ending, hence: *a pledge for a debt*. Similarly, וידו אדם Ezek. 1, 8 (*ketib*) and נחלתו בניו 46, 17 are to be explained in the same manner.⁴⁶ The circumstance to which Nöldeke calls attention, that חוב is met with elsewhere only in Aramaic, gives us ground for doubting the genuineness of the word least of all in Ezekiel who elsewhere shows a predilec-

⁴⁴ It must be owned that the plural *ἔργα* occurs elsewhere also for the singular מלאכה.

⁴⁵ ZDMG., LVII, 418, n. 2.

⁴⁶ Comp. *Analekten*, 73, where further examples are given.

tion for Aramaic expressions in a high degree.⁴⁷ Moreover, if we accept Luzzatto's conjecture which is exceedingly plausible, we should read also Jer. 17, 4 ושמטת חובך for ושמטתה ובך.

Ezek. 22, 3 ועשתה גלולים עליה לטמאה. In the place of the superfluous and difficult עליה the original perhaps read על י, i. e. על יהוה. The abbreviation was then misunderstood and expanded so as to read עליה.⁴⁸ Comp. Ex. 20, 5 לא יהיה לך and על נשיו...; similarly Gen. 28, 9 אלהים אחרים על פני ויקה את... ואם תקח נשים על בנותי 31, 50 לו לאשה.

Ezek. 23, 24 ובאו אליך הצן רכב וגלגל ובקהל עמים צנה ומגן וקובע ישימו עליך סביב. The words ובקהל עמים do not fit in well at all and disturb the context. In spite of the fact that the words were read by the versions, I would conjecture that there stood originally *at the beginning of the verse* ובאו קהל עמים עליך.⁴⁹ The words dropped out in consequence of an error, and a copyist who noted the mistake wrote the omitted two words at the place proper between the lines introducing them by וב, i. e. ובאו, whereby he indicated that the words should be inserted after ובאו. A subsequent copyist mistook this insertion and wrote the letters וב together with קהל as one word; thus arose ובקהל עמים. By a further error, the two words were subsequently inserted in the wrong place.

For similar examples in Ezek. where in the case of inserted passages a catchword was prefixed and sometimes abbreviated see Rost, *OLZ.*, VII (1904), 390 ff. and 479 ff.; see also further on my note on Ezek. 37, 26.

⁴⁷ Comp. Selle, *De Aramaismis libri Ezech.*, 1890; and my own observation above s. v. שמות (on Ezek. 26, 3) and on גול (Ezek. 37, 11) in *OLZ.*, XII (1909), col. 251 f.

⁴⁸ Comp. *Analekten*, 12, and especially 16 on Ps. 145, 12. For further instances of the abbreviation of the *tetragrammaton* by means of ' see further below on Ps. 20, 10; 131, 2.

⁴⁹ Comp. in a similar context Jer. 50, 9 הנה אנכי מעיר ומעלה על בבל קהל גוים גדולים.

Ezek. 24, 4 אסף נתחיה אֵלֶיהָ כל נתח טוב ירך וכתף. It has been long suggested that כל נתח טוב represents a later addition. This conjecture becomes more probable if we read אֵלֶיהָ "fat tail" in the place of אֵלֶיהָ; thus three choice pieces (אֵלֶיהָ ירך and וכתף) would appear in collocation, and כל נתח טוב would then constitute a suitable explanation. We know from I Sam. 9, 24 where והאלה השוק את should be read⁵⁰ that the אלה was regarded as a choice piece which was reserved for the guest of honor.

Now the strange reading נתחיה for which the Septuagint and Peshiṭta correctly read נתחים, is explained: once the false reading אלה was in vogue, it was natural to change the immediately preceding נתחים into נתחיה.

Ezek. 30, 4 ובאה חרב במצרים is perhaps corrupted from חררה which fits in well with the parallel חלחלה; comp. verse 9 where in a similar context להחריר and חלחלה form a parallel. According to Cornill, we should read חררה for the first חרב also 38, 21. For the interchange of ב and ד see above on Isa. 60, 4.

Ezek. 37 14 והנחתי אתכם על ארמאתם is strange. According to the context, we should rather expect a verb meaning "lead," "bring." It is therefore not too bold a conjecture to propose the pointing והנחיתי; comp. verse 21 והבאתי אותם אל ארמאתם. Though הנחה is nowhere else met with in construction with על, we have examples of this very construction in the case of the synonymous verbs נהל (Isa. 49, 10; Ps. 23, 2) and הוליך (II Kings 25, 20).

Ezek. 37, 23 אשר חטאו בהם seems to stand in the wrong place. It appears rather to belong immediately after בכל פשעיהם comp. 18, 31 את כל פשעיכם אשר פשעתם בהם. If we thus transpose the words, it becomes unnecessary to change, with Symmachus, מושבותיהם into מושבותיהם. Indirectly, the transposition is favored by the fact that the Septuagint did not find the three words

⁵⁰ See Geiger, *Urschrift*, 380 f.

ובשקוציהם ובכל פשעיהם at all in its Hebrew text, rendering at the same time מכל מושבתיהם by ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν.

Ezek. 37, 26 ונתתים is unintelligible, superfluous, and wanting in the Septuagint and Peshitta. The Septuagint omits in addition the immediately following words והרביתי אותם. Perhaps the text, in the form in which the Septuagint found it, read originally: ברית עולם יהיה אותם ונתתי את מקדשי בתוכם לעולם. On the basis of passages like Jer. 30, 19; Ezek. 36, 10, 11, a later scribe, it seems, inserted after יהיה אותם the words והרביתי אותם. This addition foreign to the original text induced a copyist to put right above it ונתתי מ', i. e. ונתתי מקדשם, by which he desired to indicate that in the place of והרביתי אותם the reader should proceed immediately with the following ונתתי את מקדשי. This gloss ונתתי מ' was erroneously contracted into one word ונתתים which then subsequently was received into the text; see above on 23, 24.

Mic. 5, 13 והשמרתי עריך is strange. In the first place, the cities have been mentioned in verse 10; secondly, from verse 11 on only objects of idolatrous worship are named. The proposed emendation ועצבך is too violent. The parallel אשריך suggests the reading יעריך "thy (sacred) groves."⁵¹ No example, it is true, is available for יער in this specific sense. On the other hand, the verb השמר is used frequently (comp. Lev. 26, 30; Num. 33, 52) just with reference to the destruction of places of idolatrous worship; in the former place God is the speaker exactly as in our passage. The identical error is present Ezek. 6, 6 where in a similar context we read in our present text הערים for which we should read with Cornill היערים.

Zeph. 3, 20 ובעת קבצי אתכם is, as has long been recognized, impossibly correct. There is nevertheless no occasion for so radical a change as ובעת ההיא אקבץ; we are simply to read ובעת קבצי אתכם, which phrase fits the context admirably and is so common that illustrations would be superfluous. For the dropping out of the א and the resultant joining of the ב

⁵¹ The omission of the י after a word ending in a י is another instance of the phenomenon discussed in *Analekten*, 44 f.; comp. also Luzzatto on Jer. 23, 14. The instances adduced there might be considerably multiplied; comp. e. g. below on Ps. 50, 19.

to the following word we have numerous examples elsewhere; see *Analekten*, 49. In addition to the instances there adduced we may mention also **בנר** Gen. 30, 11 and **באשרי** Gen. 30, 13; comp. also Prov. 13, 10 where I. Kahan proposes **בא וזון** for **בזון**.

Zech. 9, 2 **וּגַם חֶמֶת תִּנְבֵּל בָּהּ** is perhaps corrupted from **חֶמֶת וּנְבֵל**. The **ת** in **תִּנְבֵּל** is probably only a dittogram of **חֶמֶת**. Exactly as in our passage **צוֹר וּצִירֹן** follow immediately thereon, so is **נְבֵל** found also Ezek. 27, 9 by the side of those two cities.

Zech. 12, 8 **כַּמְלֵאךְ יִהְיֶה** seems to me to represent a later gloss on the **כְּאֱלֹהִים**, for the sake of mitigating the bold comparison. The Targum proceeds similarly in passages like the present.

Ps. 10, 17 **תְּכִין לָבָם תִּקְשִׁיב אוֹנֵךְ**. The words **תְּכִין לָבָם** have thus far received no satisfactory explanation.⁵² The translation given by Kautzsch: "Thou quickenest their courage" is just as little acceptable. As a matter of fact, **לָבָם תְּכִין** occurs elsewhere only in a reflexive sense, = "direct one's own mind to something"; it is never used as here with reference to another person's heart. Nevertheless, it is altogether unnecessary to read, as has been proposed, **לָבָה תְּכִין**. All the difficulty disappears if we merely change the pointing: **לָבָם תִּכֵּן** "weigher (fathomer) of their heart"; comp. Prov. 21, 2; 24, 12 where **תִּכֵּן לָבוֹת** is used as here as an epithet of the Deity. As far as the sense goes, the nearest parallel to our passage is Ps. 17, 1-3 where the psalmist equally grounds his hope that his prayer may be heard on the conviction that God has proved him. It is quite possible that in the difficult phrase **וּתְכִינוֹן צִדִּיק** Ps. 7, 10 there is likewise present a corrupt form of **תִּכֵּן**; comp. the parallel **וּבָחֵן לָבוֹת** and **וּכְלִיֹּת**.

⁵² The Septuagint (*ἐτοιμασίαν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν*) took **תְּכִין** in the sense of New-Hebrew **תְּכִינוֹן**; there is, however, no ground for assuming a specific nominal form **תִּכֵּן** (Krochmal) or **תִּכְנֵן** (Chajes). The Talmud (Tos. Berakot 3, 4 and parallels), likewise, interprets in the same fashion as the Septuagint: **הַמְתַּפֵּל לִצְדִּיק שִׁיבוֹן אֶת לְבוֹ אָבָא שְׂאוֹל אוֹמֵר סִימֵן לְחַפְלָה תְּכִינוֹן לָבָם תִּקְשִׁיב אוֹנֵךְ**.

Ps. 20, 10 יֵעֲנֹנֹה הַיּוֹם קִרְאֵנוּ has perhaps arisen out of יְיָ עֲנֵנוּ, i. e. יהוה עננו; comp. above on Ezek. 22, 3.

Ps. 29, 3 קוֹל יְהוָה עַל הַמִּיִּם is strange when contrasted with the other verses where invariably a quality or effect of the Divine voice is referred to. I therefore conjecture that עַל הַמִּיִּם and הַרְעִים should be transposed; the whole passage would thus read קוֹל יְהוָה הַרְעִים אֶל הַכְּבוֹד עַל הַמִּיִּם יְהוָה עַל מֵי רַבִּים. The expression קוֹל יְהוָה הַרְעִים will not be taken exception to on the grounds of style when Job 37, 4 וְאַחֲרָיו יִשְׁאַן קוֹל is compared where קוֹל in a similar context is likewise employed as subject.

Ps. 37, 22 seems to have changed places with verse 26. The latter verse fits in less well in its present location after verse 25 than after verse 21 of which it is a continuation. In the same manner verse 22 goes well with verse 25 for which it gives the reason; it is certainly out of place after verse 21, there being nothing in that verse for which the clause introduced by כִּי may serve as a reason.

Ps. 45, 11 שְׁמַעִי בַת וְרָאִי. The apostrophe to the queen as בַּת without further addition is strange. I would therefore suggest that the original read (as in verse 13) שְׁמַעִי בַת צוּר וְרָאִי. The omission of the word is readily accounted for by haplography (צור ור).

Ps. 48, 10 רִמִּינוּ אֱלֹהִים חֶסֶדְךָ is strange, because the vocative אֱלֹהִים is in no wise prepared. I should propose the reading אֱלֹהִים; "we liken Thy mercy (in its magnitude) to the seas."⁸³ This would do justice to the parallelism: verse 11 כְּשִׁמְיָהּ and עַל קִצְיִי, hence the sea, the heavens, and the earth as objects of comparison for the infinite greatness of God; comp. the cognate passage Ps. 36, 6-7 where it similarly reads מִשְׁפַּטֵּי תְהוֹמֹת רַבָּה. The word יָם itself, it is true, occurs elsewhere as a figure of greatness in a totally different context: גְּדוֹל כִּיִּם שְׁבַרְךָ Lam. 2, 13.

⁸³ אֱלֹהִים = "liken unto" as Isa. 40, 18, 25.

⁸⁴ So read for כְּשִׁמְיָהּ; *Analekten*, 62.

Ps. 50, 19 פִּיךָ שֶׁלַחַת בָּרַעָה. The object פִּיךָ to שֶׁלַח is exceedingly strange. Perhaps the original read כַּפִּיךָ (as frequently יִרְשָׁלַם), the כ dropped out by haplography (the preceding word ends in ך); see above on Mic. 5, 13. The clause should then be rendered: "Thou puttest thy hand forth after ill-gotten wealth" (or perhaps "with evil intention"?). Perhaps we ought to read with Chajes בָּרַעַ which would fit in well with the following verse.

Ps. 51, 6 לְמַעַן תִּצְדַּק בְּרִבְרִךְ תִּזְכָּה בְּשַׁפְטֶךָ should be pointed in either case as *Piel*: תִּצְדַּק, תִּזְכָּה. The sense is this: I confess openly my guilt, that Thou mayest justify and clear me.

Ps. 78, 65 יִקְצֶה בִּישׁוֹן ה' כְּנִבּוֹר מִתְרוֹנִן מִיּוֹן. For כְּנִבּוֹר read with Peshitta כְּנִבְרָה; comp. Jer. 23, 9 עֲבְרוּ יִין כְּנִבְרָה. Similarly we find II Sam. 22, 26 נִבּוֹר for Ps. 18, 26 נִבְרָה. For מִתְרוֹנִן I should read conjecturally מִתְהוֹנִן "coming back to his senses" (comp. Syriac אֲתִהוֹנִן); comp. the rendering of the Targum מִתְפַּקֵּחַ. Similarly b. Berakot 30b כְּדִי שֶׁתִּתְהוֹנֵן arose perhaps through the concurrence of the following שֶׁתִּתְהוֹלֵל, the original reading being שֶׁתִּתְהוֹנֵן. The error must then, of course, date from very early times; for the haggadic exposition (from וַאֲתַחֲנֵן) which follows presupposes the reading with ח.

Ps. 88, 17 צִמְתּוֹתַי has, it is true, been long recognized as a scribal error for צִמְתּוֹתַי; but no satisfactory explanation has as yet been offered for the fact that just in this passage a superfluous ת was introduced into the text. I take it that the ת moved up from the end of verse 19 where we should read with Peshitta מִיִּדְעִים חֲשֹׁכֶת. Once the faulty reading of the Masoretic text had come into existence, a scribe at a later period added the missing ת which he placed above the line. By error, it moved further up and so came to be inserted in צִמְתּוֹתַי. It is probable that the manuscript in question comprised two whole verses in *one* line; then indeed מַחֲשָׁךְ and צִמְתּוֹתַי stood above each other. An error of a quite similar character underlies the text of Job 15, 31-32; comp. *Analekten*, 82, and further below on Prov. 28, 1.

Ps. 119, 43 ואל תצל מפי דבר אמת. As far as I know, the correctness of the text has been questioned by nobody. Nevertheless, the sense in which הצל is used here is very strange; for elsewhere it means only "take something away from someone by violence," but not, as here, "deny something to someone." I therefore suspect that תצל in the present passage should be derived from אצל; the omission of the א is a regular feature of verbs פ"א. An exact parallel is the passage Eccl. 2, 10: ובל אשר שאלו עיני לא אצלתי מהם.

Ps. 131, 2 כנמל עלי נפשי, it is true, no grammatical difficulty; nevertheless, the use of עלי and על in two totally different senses in so close a proximity is not quite probable. The ancient versions appear to have had difficulties in understanding the three words: witness their efforts at translating them. All difficulty disappears when we read על י' (= על יהוה) for עלי. It will be found that thus the figure used in the clause preceding is carried out more consistently, the parallelism being of the chiasmic order: "I have composed and quieted my soul as a child that is weaned of his mother, even as a weaned child is toward the Lord my soul." As for י', standing for יהוה, see above on Ezek. 22, 3.

Ps. 146, 6 השומר אמר לעולם is very weak. We rather expect (as in the immediately preceding verses) the class of men mentioned with whom God keeps faith. I therefore propose to point לעוֹלָם: "He keepeth faith with the *ungodly*." In Exod. 34, 6 it is expressly stated that God shows mercy and truth even to sinners. We find elsewhere quite a number of examples where forms of the stem עול and the word עולם are confounded; so e. g. Ps. 37, 28 where the missing strophe beginning with ע is restored (in part after the Septuagint) by reading עוֹלָם נשמרו for לעולם נשמרו; Job 22, 15 הארח עולם תשמר for which we should likewise read with Chajes עוֹלָם; comp. also my remarks on Ps. sal. 2, in *OLZ.*, V (1902), col. 278.

Ps. 147, 15 עד מהרה ירוץ דברו. The phrase עד מהרה occurs only in this passage; nor is it quite clear what the meaning

is of the superfluous ער. While our text is attested by the Septuagint, the preposition (ער) is omitted in the Peshiṭta. I therefore conjecture that ער was originally intended as a gloss on השלח אמרתו ארץ, the glossator wishing to indicate that ארץ here is to be taken in the sense of ער ארץ.⁵⁵ By error, the gloss moved down to its place before מהרה.

Prov. 1, 18 והם לרמם יארבו יצפנו לנפשתם. It is not easy to see what the suffixes in לרמם and לנפשתם refer to. It has therefore been proposed to read, on the basis of the Septuagint and a single manuscript in Kennicott's collection, as in verse 11, לרם. But לנפשתם still remains a puzzle. I therefore suspect that the original read והם לנפש תם,⁵⁶ comp. 29, 10 אנשי דמים ישנאו תם; Ps. 64, 5 לירות במסתרים תם. Moreover, the synonym לנקי in the parallel passage verse 11 speaks in favor of לנפשתם. Once the two words were erroneously welded together into לנפשתם, for the sake of the parallelism the suffix of the third person plural had to be appended to דם likewise.

Prov. 24, 11 הצל לקחים למות ומטים להרג אם תחשוך. For מטים which occurs nowhere else in the sense of "tottering toward something" and, moreover, is rather weak by the side of the plastic לקחים, I would read מטים: "that are stretched out." In New-Hebrew we meet with the phrase נטוי למות (e. g. Eccl. rabba on 5. 6; Pesikṭa, ed. Buber, 181a.)

Prov. 25, 1 נסו ואין רודף רשע וצדיקים ככפיר יבטח. The superfluous ו of נסו which is missing in the Septuagint as well as in one Hebrew manuscript, belongs to the end of the verse where we should read יבטחו in consonance with the subject צדיקים. The mistake arose through יבטחו being written (as often) defectively: יבטח. The missing ו was then added by a copyist above the line, which by mistake was drawn to the word נס which happened to stand right above it; see above on Ps. 88, 17.

⁵⁵ Comp. verse 6 עדי ארץ.

⁵⁶ The construct state combination תם לנפש is paralleled by נפש צדיק Prov. 10, 3.

Prov. 31, 11 וּשְׁלָל לֹא יִחְסֵר is very strange in this context; for וּשְׁלָל which does not fit in well at all we should expect some ideal possession to be mentioned. Perhaps the original read וּשְׁלָם לֹא יִחְסֵר which would fit in well with the parallel בְּטָח. The simplest way to account for the error is to assume that in some texts the word was abbreviated: וּשְׁל, which then was falsely resolved into וּשְׁלָל.

Job 21, 9 שְׁלֹם מִפְּחָד. There is no ground for emending with the versions שְׁלָמוֹ; rather read שְׁלֹם; comp. 12, 6 quite similarly יִשְׁלִיז אֱהָלִים לְשֹׁדְדִים.

Job 31, 33 אִם כִּסִּיתִי כְּאֶדָם פְּשָׁעִי. Read מֵאֲדָם: "If I covered my transgressions *before* men," to which the parallel לִטְמֹן בְּחַיֵּי עוֹנֵי is a suitable sequel. For the construction comp. Gen. 18, 17 הִמְכַסֶּה אֲנִי מֵאַבְרָהָם אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה. The interchange of כ and מ is to be explained on the basis of the Old Hebrew script; comp *Analekten*, 52.

Cant. 3, 6 מִי זֹאת עָלָה מִן הַמִּדְבָּר כְּתִימְרוֹת עֵשֶׂן מִקְטָרֶת מֵרֹלְבֹנָה. It owes its obscurity to a mistake in the pointing. We ought manifestly to read מִקְטָרֶת: "Who is this that cometh up out of the wilderness like pillars of smoke *from the perfume* of myrrh and frankincense." The words מִכֵּל אֲבָקָת רֹכֵךְ seem to be a mere gloss on what precedes. The smoke as it comes up straight out of the incense (comp. Ezek. 8, 11) is indeed a fitting object of comparison.

Lam. 1, 14 נִשְׁקָד עַל פְּשָׁעִי. It is generally agreed to point the first two words on the basis of the versions and the Midrash עַל נִשְׁקָד; but no one has noticed that the word פְּשָׁעִי is likewise badly pointed. There cannot be any reasonable doubt that the correct pointing should be פִּשְׁעִי (from פִּשַׁע I Sam. 20, 3): "He hath watched for my *steps*"; comp. Job 13, 27; 14, 16; 33, 11. The words נִשְׁקָד עַל פְּשָׁעִי express the same as פָּרַשׁ רֶשֶׁת לְרֹגְלִי in verse 13.

Lam. 1, 20 מחזין שכלה חרב בבית כמות. On the basis of the parallel passage Deut. 32, 25 מחזין תשכל חרב ומחדרים אימה I would assume that in the present passage the word אימות dropped out in front of כמות; the whole probably read originally בבית אימות כמות. For the expression comp. Ps. 55, 5 ואימות מות. As for the graphic ground for the omission see *Analekten*, 91.

Lam. 2, 2 הגיע לארץ חלל ממלכה ושריה. It is stylistically exceedingly uncommon to find a single object depending upon two verbs asyndetically placed by the side of each other, especially, as is the case here, when the verbs are separated by an additional word. I therefore believe that the original read הגיע לארץ ⁵⁷ הגיעל חלל ממלכה ושריה; to this the following חלל ממלכה ושריה is indeed a suitable parallel. The word ארץ without the article to designate the land of Judah is found once more Jer. 3, 2. The *Hiphil* הגיעל occurs only once more, Job 21, 10, in a different context; but the *Kal* is found Jer. 14, 19 exactly as in our passage of God abhorring Zion.

Lam. 2, 4 נצב ימינו בצר is strange not only on account of the masculine form of the verb, but particularly for the reason that in the parallel parts of the verse transitive verbs are employed. An old manuscript⁵⁸ reads הציב; it will, however, suffice to point נצב (as *Piel*); comp. Arabic *naṣṣaba* used of the horse pricking up the ears.

Lam. 2, 16 בלענו is doubly difficult: in the first place, an object is wanting (hence it is that the Septuagint and Peshiṭta supply the object in translation as if the text read בלענוה; comp. Ps. 35, 25); secondly, בלענו is suitable only in the mouth of the Babylonians who actually conquered Judah, but not, as we read now, in the mouth of third parties who remained inactive and

⁵⁷ The error arose at a time when no vowel letters were used in the text; thus especially in connection with the division of the word from one line to another the received reading would easily arise out of הגיעל; comp. *Analekten*, 40, and below on Lam. 3, 49.

⁵⁸ Comp. Harkavy, *Neuaufgefundene hebr. Bibelhandschriften*, St. Petersburg 1884, 23.

only gazed at the misfortune of Judah with malicious joy. I therefore am bold enough to propose the reading בֵּל עָנִי: "O Bel, O Anu! certainly this is the day that we looked for; we have found, we have seen it." The nations hostile to the Jews thus give thanks to the Babylonian gods for having brought about the overthrow of Judah.⁵⁹ While בֵּל occurs several times in the Old Testament, no example is available for עָנִי (if we except the proper name עֲנַמְלֹךְ). The author of the poem was certainly familiar with the Babylonian religion; the proof is afforded by the peculiar use of לְבָרָה in 4, 10⁶⁰ in the sense of Labartu as a common noun designating demons; comp. my article "Labartu im A. T." in *OLZ.*, VI (1903), 244-45.

Lam. 2, 22 אֲשֶׁר טַפַּחְתִּי is rendered in the Septuagint *ὡς ἐπεκράτησα* which it is certainly difficult to bring into consonance with the meaning of the Hebrew verb. I suspect that the Greek is corrupt: the translator most likely wrote: *ἐπεκρότησα* having had in mind the sense which the word has in New-Hebrew ("strike," "beat," both in the *Qal* and *Piel*) unsuitable though the meaning be in the present passage. We find *ἐπικροτεῖν* elsewhere for מָחָה (Isa. 55, 12) and חָקַע (Prov. 17, 18). The two Greek verbs, *ἐπικροτεῖν* and *ἐπικρατεῖν*, moreover, are confounded elsewhere (Amos 6, 5 B; Ez. 29, 7 A).

Lam. 3, 1 אֲנִי הַגִּבֹּר רָאָה עֲנִי בְּשִׁבְטֵי עֵבְרָתוֹ I would explain: "I am the man that hath seen affliction in the tribe of His (that is, God's) wrath"; שִׁבְטֵי עֵבְרָתוֹ is used here exactly in the same sense as עֵם עֵבְרָתוֹ (Isa. 10, 6) and דֹּר עֵבְרָתוֹ (Jerem. 7, 29). The writer means that he was able to study affliction by the means of a typical case.

Lam. 3, 49 עֵינֵי נִגְרָה וְלֹא תְרַמָּה מֵאֵין הַפְּנוּת. After תְּרַמָּה, מֵאֵין הַפְּנוּת sounds quite tautological, not to mention the fact that הַפְּנוּת occurs nowhere else and is grammatically peculiar. I there-

⁵⁹ Comp. Judg. 16, 23 where the Philistines give thanks to their god Dagon for their victory over Samson.

⁶⁰ It is well known that chapters 2 and 4, according to the almost universal opinion of commentators, belong to one and the same author.

fore conjecture the reading מִאֲנָה פֶּנֶּ; comp. the striking parallel passage Ps. 77, 3 יְדִי לֵילָה נִגְרָה וְלֹא תְפוּן מֵאֲנָה הִנֵּחַם נַפְשִׁי. Once מֵאֲנָה פֶּנֶּ had been corrupted through the false division of words⁶¹ into מֵאֵן הִפֵּנֶּ, a later scribe added to הִפֵּנֶּ by way of explanation or parallel the word פִּוּגָה (from 2, 18). Through the welding together of הִפֵּנֶּ and פִּוּגָה arose the faulty form in the Masoretic text; see above on Deut. 33, 16.

Eccl. 1, 8 כָּל הַדְּבָרִים יִנְעִים is simply to be explained: "All words are toiling," that is to say, no words are adequate to express it fully. With this sense the following לֹא יוֹכֵל אִישׁ לְדַבֵּר goes extremely well. In a similar context we read Sirach 43, 30 אֵל תִּלְאוּ כִּי לֹא תַחֲקֶר. Judah Ibn Tibbon, moreover, seems to have taken our passage in the sense indicated; he writes in his translation of Bahya's "Duties of the Heart"⁶² אִם הַדְּבָרִים יִנְעִים בַּעֲנִין הַנֶּפֶשׁ ק"ו בַּעֲנִין הַבּוֹרָא.

Eccl. 5, 2 כִּי בֹא הַחֲלוּם בְּרַב עֵינִין וְקוֹל כְּסִיל בְּרַב דְּבָרִים. The second half of the verse is no logical sequel to the first. In the place of קוֹל we rather expect a word which would indicate the consequences of much talking for the fool. I would therefore read קָלֹן; comp. Prov. 11, 2 בֹּא זֶרֶן וַיִּבֹּא קָלֹן. Or is קוֹל in our passage to be derived, as in Jer. 3, 9 קָלֹל, from the stem קָלַל and to be explained as "disgrace"?

Eccl. 5, 5 וְאֵל תֹּאמַר לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ כִּי שִׁנְנָה הִיא. In the place of the wholly unintelligible הַמֶּלֶךְ read מִלְאָה: "before thou fulfillest (the word)"; comp. I Kings 8, 15; Jer. 44, 25, where מִלְאָה absolute is used exactly in the same sense. The use of לִפְנֵי with a following infinitive = "before" in a temporal sense as Gen. 13, 10; I Sam. 9, 15; II Sam. 3, 13; Mal. 3, 23. Once מִלְאָךְ was incorrectly understood as מִלְאָה, the article was added.

Eccl. 7, 16 לִמָּה תְּשׁוּמֶם was read, it is true, by the versions; it is nevertheless peculiar both in form and sense. I do not therefore hesitate to propose לִמָּה תִּשָּׂא מוֹם. As א was frequently omitted

⁶¹ See above on Lam. 2, 2 where a similar error has been noted.

⁶² I, 10 (ed. Baumgarten-Stern, 34b).

at the end of a word, the Masoretic reading readily followed from חשמום; comp. *Analekten*, 47-48 on II Chr. 11, 23 and Job 27, 8, where we meet with an exactly similar case. A perfect parallel to למה מום עולם תשא Sir. 11, 33 is afforded.

Eccl. 7, 26 אשר היא מצודים is very awkward; we rather expect in this very part of the verse the mention of a part of the body as a parallel to לבה and ידיה. The difficulty disappears when we read אשריה⁶³: "her steps are snares." Perhaps the original read אשר אשר; then dropped out by haplography. As for the sense, comp. Prov. 7, 25 where men are warned of the ways of the strange woman.

Est. 1, 14 והקרב אליו is grammatically difficult of explanation. Shall we not simply point והקרַב (or the infinitive והקַרַב)? Comp. Ex. 28, 1; Num. 16, 5, 9, where הקריב אליו is used as here in the sense: "permit one to draw near to oneself."

Neh. 5, 11 ומאת הכסף cannot possibly be correct. The commentators therefore follow Geiger in reading ומשאת which indeed fits the context admirably, but is nevertheless open to objection, it being difficult to account for the dropping out of the ש. May we not rather read ומדת הכסף as in verse 4 למדת ליינו כסף למדת? It is easy to understand how this rare (originally Babylonian) word would be replaced by למאת, particularly if we remember that in the Old Hebrew alphabet א and ד are quite similar; comp. Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griech. Übersetzung der Proverben*, on 19, 28; 24, 2; 28, 2; and my *Analekten*, 50, on Isa. 65, 23.

I Chr. 29, 22 וימשחו ליהוה לנניד is grammatically peculiar because of the want of an object to וימשחו and also for the reason that ליהוה is superfluous. I suspect that the original read לה: "and they anointed him to be ruler." A later scribe mistook לה for an abbreviated ליהוה; see above on Gen. 31, 13. Now the parallelistic structure of our verse is completely restored, the

⁶³ Ps. 10, 6 some exegetes propose likewise the reading אשרי for אשר.

construction of the object with ל occurring three times. The spelling הל for לו does not, it is true, occur elsewhere in the Old Testament; but that may be a mere accident as the possessive suffix is frequently found spelled with ה.